

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,376,277 to Corisis (hereafter "Corisis"). Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis of the prior art, the claims have been amended to more fully describe the subject matter therein.

Applicants' amended claim 13 requires "mounting a plurality of semiconductor devices within said mold formation cavity directly to at least one of said upper and lower sections, each of said semiconductor devices being mounted separately within said formation cavity" (emphasis added). Corisis instead teaches mounting the semiconductor devices as a single component. The semiconductor devices in Corisis are already mounted to a substrate before they are placed in the formation cavity. (See Corisis: FIG.6A, semiconductor dice 20 are mounted on a single substrate 5). Therefore, it would be impossible to mount them inside the cavity separately.

Furthermore, Applicants' amended claim 13 requires that the semiconductor devices are mounted directly to either the top or bottom sections of the cavity or to both. (See Application: FIG.3 and FIG.13). Corisis shows the semiconductor dice 20 mounted directly on a substrate 5 which is rested on a lower member 72. The individual semiconductor devices taught by Applicants' claim 13 are not mounted to a substrate at this point in the manufacturing process. This allows the individual semiconductor devices to be treated before being mounted to a substrate. The treated semiconductor devices may

then be packaged using a different process and mounted to a substrate of the packager's choosing.

Corisis does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the limitations of Applicants' amended claim 13. Claim 13 is therefore allowable. Claims 14-19 depend from claim 13 and as such are also allowable.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

On page 4 of the Office Action mailed on September 30, 2005, the Examiner states the following:

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c), and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Although Applicants are aware of their duty of disclosure under 37 C.F.R. 1.56, it is unclear what the Examiner means by "a later invention" and what is required in response to paragraph 4 on page 4. Applicants submit that they have complied with all provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.56 and respectfully request a clarification if the Examiner wishes Applicants to respond further.

The Examiner has rejected claims 33, 34, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corisis

in view of knowledge that the Examiner believes is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis of the prior art and any conclusions regarding the body of knowledge that is well known in the art, claim 33 has been amended to more fully describe the subject matter therein.

Claim 33 contains similar amendments as claim 13. Similarly as discussed above with respect to claim 13, Corisis does not teach all of the limitations of claim 33 nor does the Examiner allege that these limitations are well known in the art. Because the references taken alone or in combination do not teach all of the limitations of Applicants' amended claim 33, the claim is not rendered obvious and is otherwise allowable.

Claims 34, 36 and 37 all depend from allowable claim 33 and as such are also allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corisis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,252,254 to Soules et al (hereafter "Soules"). It is noted that claim 35 depends from allowable claim 33 and as such is also allowable.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 33-37.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 13-19 and 33-37 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaye G. Heybl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,661

January 30, 2006

Koppel, Jacobs, Patrick, & Heybl
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
Phone 805 373 0060,
Fax 805 373 0051